

### REMARKS

The non-final Office Action of January 12, 2010, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1, 15 and 31 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 35 and 36 are presently cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 9, 13-16, 18, 19, 22-24 and 31-34 are pending upon entry of the present amendment.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Applicants note with appreciation the indication that claims 15, 16, 18, 19 and 31-34 are allowed.

#### ***Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112***

Claims 35 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Without acquiescing to the rejection, Applicants have cancelled claims 35 and 36, thus rendering this rejection moot.

#### ***Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §101***

Claims 35 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Without acquiescing to the rejection, Applicants have cancelled claims 35 and 36, thus rendering this rejection moot.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 1, 6, 9, 13, 14, 22, 23 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fischer (U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2004/0246932, “Fischer”) in view of Zhong *et al.* (U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2006/0193296, “Zhong”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*,

establishing, by a first wireless terminal, a beacon interval for an ad-hoc network; and

broadcasting beacon frames from the first wireless terminal at the beacon intervals, wherein one or more of the beacon frames comprise an identifier list

including identifiers of wireless terminals belonging to the ad-hoc network, the identifiers including an identifier of a second wireless terminal different from the first wireless terminal.

Neither Fischer nor Zhong, either separately or in combination, teaches or suggests such features. The Office Action concedes at p. 7 that Fischer does not particularly show that one or more beacon frames comprises an identifier list, where the identifier list includes identifiers of wireless terminals belonging to the ad-hoc network. Instead, the Office Action relies on Zhong, alleging that Zhong describes a beacon frame including an identifier list having identifiers of wireless terminals belonging to an ad-hoc network at paras. [0027], [0045] and FIGS. 1B and 4-8. Applicants respectfully disagree. None of the cited passages teach or suggest that an identifier list is included in a beacon frame or transmitted. While Zhong describes each STA 100 keeping a list of source STA identifies from which it expects to receive packets at para. [0045], Zhong does not teach or suggest that this list is broadcasted, much less broadcasted in a beacon frame. Thus, Zhong clearly fails to cure the admitted deficiencies of Fischer. Accordingly, notwithstanding whether the asserted combination is proper, the combination would not have resulted in the features of claim 1. Claim 1 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Amended independent claim 22 recites features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1 and is thus allowable for substantially the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 6, 9, 13, 14, 22 and 23 are dependent claims and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

Claims 7 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fischer in view of Zhong and further in view of Runick (U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2002/0131371, "Runick").

Claims 7 and 24 are dependent on one of claims 1 and 22, respectively. As discussed herein, neither Fischer nor Zhong teach or suggest each and every feature of claims 1 and 22. Runick does not cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Fischer and Zhong. Accordingly,

claims 7 and 24 are allowable over the asserted combination of Fischer, Zhong and Runick.

**CONCLUSION**

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same. Should the Examiner find that a telephonic or personal interview would expedite passage to issue of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below. If any additional required fees are or if an overpayment has been made the Commissioner is authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. 19-0733. Applicants look forward to passage to issue of the present application at the earliest convenience of the Office.

Respectfully submitted,  
**BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.**

Date: April 26, 2010

By:           /Chunhsi Andy Mu/            
Chunhsi Andy Mu  
Reg. No. 58,216

1100 13th Street, N.W.  
Suite 1200  
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051  
(202) 824-3000